



228

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CWP-1195-2019**Date of Decision: **17.02.2025**

Monu

...Petitioner

Versus

Cholamandlam MS General Insurance Co. Ltd. and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**Present:** Mr. Kartik Khicher, Advocate for
Mr. Vijay, Advocate,
for the petitioner.Dr. Malvika Singh, Advocate (Legal-Aid-Counsel)
for respondent No.1.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed for setting aside the impugned order dated 29.10.2018 (Annexure P-1) vide which the Permanent Lok Adalat, Gurugram has dismissed the application (Annexure P-2) under Section 22-C of the Legal Services Authority Act, 1987 for settlement of dispute on account of lack of territorial jurisdiction.

2. Though, learned counsel for the petitioner made an attempt to satisfy this Court that since the vehicle was got repaired at Gurugram, therefore, Permanent Lok Adalat at Gurugram has jurisdiction, however, he is unable to point out any relevant provision of law in this regard.

3. On perusal of the record, it reveals that insurance policy was issued from Chandigarh Branch, whereas, the place of occurrence/accident is in district Auraiya (Uttar Pradesh). The relevant extract of the order

passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat, Gurugram is as under:-

“Application presented today. It be checked and registered. Heard. The insurance policy has been issued from the Chandigarh branch office and the place of occurrence of the accident of the vehicle in question is in Distt. Auraiya, Uttar Pardesh. Hence, no cause of action has arisen at Gurugram. So the present application is dismissed being not maintainable at Gurugram. File be consigned to record room.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to point out any provision to satisfy this Court that the PLA at Gurugram, had territorial jurisdiction to pass the said order, therefore, the application preferred by the petitioner before the PLA at Gurugram is a misconceived motion, on account of territorial jurisdiction. Accordingly, impugned order requires no interference and the same is hereby maintained, and the present petition stands **dismissed**. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to approach the competent authority/Court of territorial jurisdiction in accordance with law.

17.02.2025

Parveen kumar

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No